DETAILED ACTION

a. This action is taken to response to Request for Continued Examination filed on 6/18/2010.

b. Claims 44, 60-62, and 81-85 are pending in this Office Action. Claims 82-85 are newly added.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 18, 2010 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 60 recites, "storing the single link identification in each of the nodes in the set." The only relevant recitation that the Examiner was able to identify appears in the specification at page 42, lines 13-21, where it states: "Each event which links data within DataSea stores a link ID along with it. Thus any two nodes can be linked together more than once, each link having a different ID to differentiate the context of their being linked.". There is no indication for "storing the single link identification in each of the nodes".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 60-62, and 84-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Weinberg et al. (U.S. 6,144,962, hereinafter Weinberg).

As to claim 60, Weinberg discloses **a method for associating linked nodes** (Fig. 1)**, wherein each of the nodes contains computer-readable data, at least one link to another one of the nodes, and a link identification for each event which links said each of the nodes to another one of the nodes** (Figs. 1-4, col. 3, lines 9-30, col. 12, lines 17-21)**, and wherein the**

linked nodes are structured such that when one of the nodes is designated as a point of view, representations of the nodes can be displayed as a sea of node representations (Figs. 1-6, 13-15, col. 25, line 43 to col. 26, line 19) **said method including the steps of**:

storing, in a context node, a meaningful context common to a set of the nodes, wherein the context node is linked to each of the nodes in the set (Fig. 15, 200, 204, col. 25, line 43 to col. 26, line 12); **and**

sharing a single link identification among the nodes in said set, including by storing the single link identification in each of the nodes in the set to identify each of the nodes in the set as being linked to another one of the nodes in the set (Figs. 1-4 depicts and col. 5, lines 43-48 describes, a navigation link from one document is generally a high-lighted word in a document that is of the document, the navigation starting node. Further, the word is a navigation link of the navigation starting node. As the link is identified and selected by a mouse click, a jump is performed to the destination document, the destination node. The link is shared by both the starting and destination nodes), **thereby associating the nodes that are identified by said single link identification** (Fig. 15, link between Infoseek and Titles).

As to claim 61, Weinberg discloses the method of claim 60, also including the step of modulating a connection strength of the links that are identified by said single link identification, thereby sensitizing or desensitizing said links to further operations (Fig. 19, col. 28, lines 45 to col. 29, lines 6).

As to claim 62, Weinberg discloses **a method of establishing a set of linked nodes from data organized in rows and columns with column headings** (Figs. 1, 4 and col. 16, lines 40-57, where a set of linked nodes is established from a list view in which data organized in row and column in the list view represents a linked node), **wherein each of the nodes includes at least one link to another one of the nodes** (Figs. 1, 4), **the nodes are indicative of computer-readable data, and the set of linked nodes is structured such that when one of the nodes is designated as a point of view, representations of the nodes can be displayed as a sea of node representations, viewed from said point of view** (Figs. 13-15, col. 25, line 43 to col. 26, line 19, simple database query was entered into a search page of the Infoseek.TM. search engine [i.e. select Infoseek.TM as a point of view]. FIG. 13, which is the first display screen of the sequence, illustrates a simple map 190 generated by opening a new map and then specifying http://www.infoseek.com/ as the URL. Displayed at the center of the map is the form page icon for the Infoseek.TM. search page. The 20 children 192 [i.e. a sea of node representations] of the form page icon correspond to external links), **said method including the steps of**:

representing each of the column headings by an abstract node (Figs. 1, 4 and col. 16, lines 40-57, annotation is represented as an abstract node 76);

representing each cell of the data by a data node (Figs. 1, 4 and col. 16, lines 40-57, each line of text displayed in the list view window 78 represents one node of the site map);

establishing links between each said abstract node and each said data node that corresponds to a cell in a column whose column heading is represented by said abstract node (Figs. 1, 4 , col. 17, lines 5-20); and

establishing links between each said data node that corresponds to a cell in one of the rows (Figs. 1, 4 and col. 16, lines 40-57, col. 17, lines 5-20, select a node in the upper window 76, the corresponding line in the List View window 78 is automatically highlighted).

As to claim 84, Weinberg discloses **a method of creating a connected network of nodes indicative of computer-readable data** (Fig. 1)**, including the step of:**

structuring the data as a connected set of linked nodes (Figs. 1, 7, 13-15, col. 9, lines 1-3, col. 25, lines 43-56, The lines which interconnect the nodes (URL icons) in FIGS. 1-3 (and the subsequent figures with screen displays) represent links between URLs), **wherein each of the nodes includes at least one link to another one of the nodes** (Fig. 1, col. 12, lines 17-21, all of the nodes of the site map (with the exception of the home page node) are displayed as having a single incoming link, even though some of the URLs of the depicted Web site actually have multiple incoming links), **the set of linked nodes is structured such that at least one of the nodes includes content indicative of a relationship between said at least one of the nodes and at least one other one of the nodes** (Figs. 1-4 and col.6, lines 38-47, relationship between nodes is established by the parent-child structure established in a graph or tree as URL and its content together indicate the relationship between the nodes)**, and such that when said other one of the nodes is designated as a point of view, representations of the nodes can be displayed as a sea of node representations** (Figs. 13-15, col. 25, line 43 to col. 26, line 19, simple database query was entered into a search page of the Infoseek.TM. search engine [i.e. select Infoseek.TM as a point of view]. FIG. 13, which is the first display screen of the sequence, illustrates a simple map 190 generated by opening a new map and then specifying

http://www.infoseek.com/ as the URL. Displayed at the center of the map is the form page icon for the Infoseek.TM. search page. The 20 children 192 [i.e. a sea of node representations] of the form page icon correspond to external links), **viewed from said point of view** (Figs. 13-15, col. 25, line 43 to col. 26, line 19)**, including by rendering said at least one of the nodes with at least one feature indicative of said relationship** (Figs. 1-6, col.6, lines 38-47, col. 7, lines 55-62, col. 10, lines 59-61, as the rendering of established relationship between nodes an indicative of the relationship)**.**

As to claim 85, Weinberg discloses the method of claim 84, also including the steps of: designating said other one of the nodes as the point of view **(**Figs. 13-15, col. 25, line 43 to col. 26, line 19)**;** and

displaying said representations of the nodes as said sea of node representations, viewed from said point of view (Figs. 13-15, col. 25, line 43 to col. 26, line 19)**.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Weinberg et al. (U.S. 6,144,962, hereinafter Weinberg) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Tesler (US Patent 6,137,499).

As to claim 44, Weinberg discloses **a method for creating a highly connected network of nodes indicative of computer-readable data** (Fig. 1), **including the steps of** :

capturing data contained in at least one legacy database (Figs. 7, 13-15, col. 3, lines 11-15, 31-36, lines 44-63, col. 17, lines 59-61, col. 28, lines 34-37, scanning and mapping of Web sites, and includes the above-described GUI features for facilitating navigation of Web site maps, col. 24, lines 7-11, database query in connection with a URL of a site map);

structuring the captured data as a set of linked nodes (Figs. 1, 7, 13-15, col. 9, lines 1-3, col. 25, lines 43-56, The lines which interconnect the nodes (URL icons) in FIGS. 1-3 (and the subsequent figures with screen displays) represent links between URLs), **wherein each of the nodes includes at least one link to another one of the nodes** (Fig. 1, col. 12, lines 17-21, all of the nodes of the site map (with the exception of the home page node) are displayed as having a single incoming link, even though some of the URLs of the depicted Web site actually have multiple incoming links), **and the set of linked nodes is structured such that when one of the**

nodes is designated as a point of view, representations of the nodes can be displayed as a sea of node representations (Figs. 13-15, col. 25, line 43 to col. 26, line 19, simple database query was entered into a search page of the Infoseek.TM. search engine [i.e. select Infoseek.TM as a point of view]. FIG. 13, which is the first display screen of the sequence, illustrates a simple map 190 generated by opening a new map and then specifying http://www.infoseek.com/ as the URL. Displayed at the center of the map is the form page icon for the Infoseek.TM. search page. The 20 children 192 [i.e. a sea of node representations] of the form page icon correspond to external links);

designating one of the nodes as the point of view (Figs. 13-15, col. 25, line 43 to col. 26, line 19); and

displaying said representations of the nodes as said sea of node representations, viewed from said point of view (Figs. 13-15, col. 25, line 43 to col. 26, line 19), **wherein said sea of node representations includes virtual reality renderings** (Figs. 4-6, col. 7, lines 55-62, col. 10, lines 59-61).

However, an alternative rejection that the argument would be obvious under 35 USC 103 is presented as Applicant argues that Weinberg does not teach "virtual reality renderings". This alternative rejection renders Applicant's argument moot.

Tesler is alternatively applied to teach "**virtual reality renderings**" (col. 1, lines 41-67, Virtual reality-based (VR) data visualizations now use hierarchies to represent large collections of complex data and data attributes. A hierarchy data visualization provides greater contextual information for electronic data in a single display view which is more easily assimilated by the

human brain than conventional data displays… a two -dimensional (2D) or three -dimensional (3D) display model representing a tree).

Weinberg and Tesler are analogous art pertinent to the problem to be solved. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine Weinberg and Tesler because it provides mapping between a three -dimensional 3D partial hierarchy and a two -dimensional 2D overview of a complete hierarchy as discussed in Tesler, abstract.

Therefore at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Weinberg and Tesler because virtual-reality data visualization conveys global and local contextual information even for large collections of complex data as suggested in Tesler, col. 1, Lines 41-67.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 81-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg et al. (U.S. 6,144,962, hereinafter Weinberg) in view of Beaudet et al. (US Patent 5,515,487, hereinafter Beaudet).

As to claim 81, Weinberg discloses **a method for creating a highly connected network of nodes indicative of computer-readable data** (Fig. 1), **including the steps of** :

capturing data contained in at least one legacy database (Figs. 7, 13-15, col. 3, lines 11-15, 31-36, lines 44-63, col. 28, lines 34-37, col. 17, lines 59-61, scanning and mapping of Web sites, and includes the above-described GUI features for facilitating navigation of Web site maps, col. 24, lines 7-11, database query in connection with a URL of a site map);

structuring the captured data as a set of linked nodes (Figs. 1, 7, 13-15, col. 9, lines 1-3, col. 25, lines 43-56, The lines which interconnect the nodes (URL icons) in FIGS. 1-3 (and the subsequent figures with screen displays) represent links between URLs), **wherein each of the nodes includes at least one link to another one of the nodes** (Fig. 1, col. 12, lines 17-21, all of the nodes of the site map (with the exception of the home page node) are displayed as having a single incoming link, even though some of the URLs of the depicted Web site actually have multiple incoming links), **and the set of linked nodes is structured such that when one of the nodes is designated as a point of view, representations of the nodes can be displayed as a sea of node representations** (Figs. 13-15, col. 25, line 43 to col. 26, line 19, simple database query was entered into a search page of the Infoseek.TM. search engine [i.e. select Infoseek.TM as a point of view]. FIG. 13, which is the first display screen of the sequence, illustrates a simple map 190 generated by opening a new map and then specifying http://www.infoseek.com/ as the URL. Displayed at the center of the map is the form page icon for the Infoseek.TM. search page. The 20 children 192 [i.e. a sea of node representations] of the form page icon correspond to external links);

designating one of the nodes as the point of view (Figs. 13-15, col. 25, line 43 to col. 26, line 19); and

displaying said representations of the nodes as said sea of node representations, viewed from said point of view (Figs. 13-15, col. 25, line 43 to col. 26, line 19), **wherein said sea of node representations includes virtual reality renderings** (Figs. 4-6, col. 7, lines 55-62, col. 10, lines 59-61).

Weinberg doses not explicitly disclose **at least some of the nodes are linked with links that determine at least one cyclic loop**.

Beaudet discloses at least some of the nodes are linked with links that determine at least one cyclic loop (Figs. 7A, 8A, col. 2, lines 12-13, displaying portions of complex graphs including trees, directed acyclic graphs and cyclic graphs on a computer display screen).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the method of Weinberg to include a method for selectively displaying portions of complex graphics including trees, directed acyclic graphics, and cyclic graphics on a computer display screen as taught by Beaudet in order to retain information concerning all nodal interconnections so that the graph information can be recalled correctly as required (Beaudet, col. 2, lines 13-16).

As to claim 82, Weinberg discloses **a method for creating a connected network of nodes indicative of computer-readable data** (Fig. 1)**, including the step of:**

structuring the data as a highly connected set of linked nodes, wherein each of the nodes includes at least one link to another one of the nodes (Fig. 1, col. 12, lines 17-21, all of the nodes of the site map (with the exception of the home page node)

Weinberg doses not explicitly disclose **at least some of the nodes are linked with links at least one of said nodes includes at least two links to another one of the nodes.**

Beaudet discloses at least some of the nodes are linked with links that includes at least two links to another one of the nodes (Figs. 7A, 8A, col. 2, lines 12-13, specifically at Fig. 8A in which nodes 10 and 12 each includes two links linking each other, including a composite link via a third node, further more, portions of complex graphs including trees, directed acyclic graphs and cyclic graphs are displayed on a computer display screen).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the method of Weinberg to include a method for selectively displaying portions of complex graphics including trees, directed acyclic graphics, **multiple links between nodes** and cyclic graphics on a computer display screen as taught by Beaudet in order to retain information concerning all nodal interconnections so that the graph information can be recalled correctly as required (Beaudet, col. 2, lines 13-16).

the set of linked nodes is structured such that when one of the nodes is designated as a point of view, representations of the nodes can be displayed as a sea of node representations, viewed from said point of view (Figs. 13-15, col. 25, line 43 to col. 26, line 19, simple database query was entered into a search page of the Infoseek.TM. search engine [i.e. select Infoseek.TM as a point of view]. FIG. 13, which is the first display screen of the sequence, illustrates a simple map 190 generated by opening a new map and then specifying

http://www.infoseek.com/ as the URL. Displayed at the center of the map is the form page icon for the Infoseek.TM. search page. The 20 children 192 [i.e. a sea of node representations] of the form page icon correspond to external links).

As to claim 83, Weinberg discloses the method of claim 82 (Fig. 1),, also including the steps of:

designating said one of the nodes as the point of view (Figs. 13-15, col. 25, line 43 to col. 26, line 19); and

displaying said representations of the nodes as said sea of node representations, viewed from said point of view (Figs. 13-15, col. 25, line 43 to col. 26, line 19).

Response to Amendment and Remarks

Applicant's remarks and arguments filed on 6/18/2010 have been fully and carefully considered.

Applicant argues that Weinberg fails to teach or suggest displaying a sea of node representations viewed from a point of view, wherein said sea of node representations includes "virtual reality renderings" as recited in claim 44. As explained in the specification, virtual reality renderings model data as physical objects in 3D (three dimensional) space…. The expression "virtual reality rendering" is not synonymous with "any" display generated by a user interface, and instead denotes a computer representation of what we call "reality," i.e., the real, physical world, or a world that is perceived as a real, physical world by one viewing the

rendering.... Weinberg's teaching (e.g., at col., 10, lines 55-64) to generate a "Visual Web Display" that allows the user to visualize relationships between "data entities" of complex Web structures, is merely a teaching to provide a user interface that generates displays of the type shown in Weinberg's figures; not a teaching to display "virtual reality renderings" as recited in claim 44.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As indicated in the office action dated 1/21/2010, the claim as it is written is completely silent regarding to the scope and definition of the "virtual reality". Therefore, the term "virtual reality" with the reasonable interpretation as 2D or 3D virtual display which can be "visualize, manipulate and interact with computer for a set of data". Furthermore, in the specification, descriptions of virtual reality rendering appear on different occasions and a wide range of descriptions of virtual reality rendering include examples inclusively or exclusively, such as mapping data sets to a 3-dimensional space is appropriate, modeling information as physical objects in 3D space is inappropriate, integrated data source of 3D machines allowing user to visual facility from different points of view is included, viewing facility to get an overview of its status is one of the renderings. Therefore, based on specification, the virtual reality rendering is self a broadly defined subject matter and its scope was described by different examples in a wide range.

As cited in the rejections, Weinberg's teaching of virtual reality rendering includes **visually viewing URLs physically from different points of view; scanning URLs of a site, creating graphical site map and allowing a user to visualize the site's layout,** which is by far beyond Applicant's alleged "merely" "a teaching to provide a user interface that generates

displays of the type shown in Weinberg's figures". Therefore, the claimed subject matter of virtual reality rendering has been reasonably interpreted and properly rejected by appropriate Figures and sections as cited.

Applicant further argues that Weinberg also fails to teach or suggest a method for associating linked nodes, including by storing a single link identification in each node of a set of nodes to identify each of the nodes in the set as being linked to another one of the nodes in the set, thereby associating the nodes that are identified by said single link identification, as recited in amended claim 60.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Regarding to newly amended limitations "including by storing a single link identification in each node of a set of nodes to identify each of the nodes in the set as being linked to another one of the nodes in the set", have been fully and carefully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Refer to the corresponding sections of the claim analysis for details.

The Examiner respectfully submits that in the specification a node contains computer readable data, including a link to another one of the nodes by link identification and the link identification is shared among nodes. Weinberg does teach the above subject matter of link as Figs. 1-4 depict and col. 5, lines 43-48 describes, a navigation link from one document is generally **a high-lighted word in a document** that teaches the high-lighted word is of the document, the navigation starting node. Further, the word is a navigation link of the navigation starting node. As the link is identified and selected by a mouse click, a jump is performed to the destination document, the destination node. Therefore the link is shared by nodes

Applicant argues that Weinberg also fails to teach or suggest a method of establishing a set of linked nodes from data organized in rows and columns with column headings, including a step of: representing each of the column headings by an abstract node (as recited in claim 62) and representing each cell of the data by a data node (as recited in claim 62); or establishing links between each said abstract node and each data node that corresponds to a cell in a column whose column heading is represented by said abstract node (as recited in claim 62).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Concerning the above arguments on which Applicant alleged Weinberg fails to teach or suggest limitations of claim 62, without specific explanations showing why or how cited fails to teach or suggest the respective subject matter, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and maintains the grounds for rejections to the claims as set forth in the office action.

Applicant further argues that Applicant is unable to identify any suggestion in Weinberg, at cited FIG. 1 or 4 or col. 16, lines 40-57 to represent each of column headings (of the recited type) by an abstract node. For example, Weinberg does not teach or suggest representing the word "Annotation" or any other column heading in lower window 78 of Weinberg's FIG. 4 as an abstract node. It cannot reasonably be contended that upper window 76 of Weinberg's FIG. 4 display represents an "abstract node." If window 76 is a representation of "an" abstract node, no element of the FIG. 4 display other than window 76 can reasonably be considered to be a representation of a "data node" as claimed.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

First, the claim as it is written is completely silent regarding to the scope and definition of the "abstract node". Therefore, it is reasonable to interpret "abstract node" as a cluster node (Fig. 4, item 76) that contains all data nodes (Fig. 4, item 84).

Second, regarding applicant's argument that the reference fails to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., display column heading description, such as word "annotation") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In this case, Weinberg clearly teach "representing each of the column headings by an abstract node" as cited in claim 62.

Applicant's arguments based on newly amended features with respect to claim 82 have been fully and carefully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Refer to the corresponding sections of the claim analysis for details.

Applicant argues that Weinberg neither teaches nor suggests displaying representations of nodes that are linked with links that determine at least one cyclic loop as recited in claim 81. Neither Weinberg nor Beaudet teaches or suggests how to display representations of nodes (linked by links that determine a cyclic loop) as a sea of node representations viewed from a point of view, or that it would be desirable to modify Weinberg's teaching to reach the invention of claim 81. There is no basis determinable from the art of record for the argument that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in view of Beaudet to modify Weinberg's teaching (or

to modify Beaudet's teaching in view of Weinberg) to reach the invention of claim 81 because the process of displaying such a sea of node representations "would tend to suppress or obscure some of the information concerning the links between the second node and the first node, because in the sea, the representation of the second node would appear as if linked by one non-branched link to the first node; not as if linked by each of the multiple non-branched links to the first node consistent with the cyclic loop".

The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

First, with respect to the above arguments Applicant alleging Weinberg fails to teach or suggest displaying representations of nodes that are linked with links that determine at least one cyclic loop. It should be noted that the Examiner does not rely upon Weinberg to teach the recited features, instead, Beaudet was introduced to provide the teaching for the recited features as indicated in claim analysis.

Second, the Examiner does recognize that asserted three criteria must be asserted in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness for rejecting the claims. Further, the obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Weinberg implements methods for facilitating the analysis and management of complex web sites and its contents in a network environment in which a unique layout and display methodology is utilized to build site maps for depicting the site's URLs and links for further allowing users to visualize web site's overall

architecture. On the other hand, as an analogous art, Beaudet implements a method for selectively displaying portions of complex graphics including trees, directed acyclic graphics, and cyclic graphics on a computer display screen while retaining information concerning all nodes interconnections so that graphic information can be correctly recalled as required. A further analysis of the revealed that, as Beaudet teaches at col. 2, lines 13-16, it is required that information concerning all nodal interconnections so that the graph information can be recalled correctly. The teaching therefore suggests and would have motivated an ordinary skilled to combine this teaching to Weinberg reference for facilitating the analysis and management of complex web sites and its contents in a network environment by retaining information concerning all nodes interconnections so that graphic information can be correctly recalled as required.

Furthermore, as prior art to the instant application, Beaudet and Weinberg tackle complicated structure problems of linked nodes in a complex hierarchical tree or graph, the combination of the two references would have reached high degree of expectation of success. Applicant's alleged the combined teaching "would tend to suppress or obscure some of the information concerning the links between the second node and the first node", because "in the sea, the representation of the second node would appear as if linked by one non-branched link to the first node; not as if linked by each of the multiple non-branched links to the first node consistent with the cyclic loop" deems a conclusion construed without being based on fact or evidence as the two references would have concisely depict nodes and links information established on complex nodal relationship in a network and the information would have been retained repeated use through recall.

For the reason given above, the Examiner believes the rejection is proper and should be sustained.

Related Prior Arts

The following list of prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Chi; Ed H. et al., US 6509898 B2, "Usage based methods of traversing and displaying generalized graph structures".

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shew-Fen Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-2672. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ Shew-Fen Lin/
Examiner, Art Unit 2166
November 6, 2010